

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

DONNA M. TRUSKY, ASHA)	
JEFFRIES, GAYNELL COLE)	Case No. 2:11-cv-12815
on behalf of themselves)	
and all others similarly situated,)	HON. SEAN F. COX
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
vs)	
)	
GENERAL MOTORS COMPANY)	
300 Renaissance Center)	
Detroit, MI48243)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO STAY
LITIGATION PENDING RULINGS FROM THE UNITED STATES
BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

For the reasons stated below, the parties in this action stipulate to entry of an Order staying proceedings before this Court, until such time as the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (“Bankruptcy Court) enters an Opinion or Order addressing the dispute identified below.

Plaintiffs in this putative class action have filed claims against General Motors LLC f/k/a General Motors Company (“New GM”), alleging that New GM breached express warranties with Plaintiffs and the putative class members. *See Amended Class Action Complaint*, dkt #15.

New GM filed a Motion to Dismiss arguing, in part, that the claims asserted and the relief sought by Plaintiffs are outside the scope of the warranty terms and impermissibly are premised on conduct of Motors Liquidation Company f/k/a General Motors

Case 1:12-ev-04097-JGK Document 20 Filed 03/07/12 Page 2 of 3

Corporation (“Old GM”). New GM contends that the claims and relief constitute a violation of the Order of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (“Bankruptcy Court”) pursuant to which New GM acquired its assets and assumed specific liabilities only. *See Motion to Dismiss*, dkt #18. Additionally, New GM contends that the adjudication of the issues noted in this paragraph is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court. Plaintiffs dispute New GM’s position and believe that they properly may pursue their claims and seek relief against New GM and in this Court. The parties’ disagreement constitutes an actual and pending dispute (the “Dispute”).

Plaintiffs believe that it would serve judicial economy for them to file a Motion before the Bankruptcy Court, in Case No. 09-50026, requesting, *inter alia*, that the Bankruptcy Court address and resolve the Dispute in paragraph 2, above.

The parties stipulate that this proceeding should be stayed pending an Opinion or Order from the Bankruptcy Court resolving the Dispute in paragraph 2, above or expressly declining to do so.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the proceedings in this action are stayed until such time as the Bankruptcy Court enters an Opinion or Order resolving the Dispute as noted above or expressly declining to do so. Although either party may notify the Court that the stay should be

lifted, it will be Plaintiffs' responsibility to ensure that the Court is properly notified of same.

SO ORDERED

Dated: November 21, 2011

s/ Sean F. Cox
Sean F. Cox
U. S. District Court Judge

SO STIPULATED

Fink + Associates Law

By: /s/ David H. Fink
David H. Fink (P28235)
Darryl Bressack (P67820)
100 West Long Lake Rd., Suite 111
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
Telephone: (248) 971-2500
dfink@finkandassociateslaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Dykema Gossett, PLLC

By: /s/ Benjamin W. Jeffers (w/ consent)
Benjamin W. Jeffers (P57161)
Michael P. Cooney (P39405)
400 Renaissance Center
Detroit, Michigan 48243
Telephone: (313) 568-5340
bjeffers@dykema.com

Attorneys for Defendant